

AUG 12 1961

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP

The Third World War

CPYRIGHT

CPYRIGHT

History à la Deutscher FOIAb3b

CPYRIGHT

JAMES BURNHAM

On July 2 the *Sunday Times* of London published a long article under the head, "New Russia-China Clash Revealed," with the subhead: *Khrushchev Accuses Mao: "Inciting World War."* The author, in whose name a World Copyright is claimed, is given as "Isaac Deutscher, author of 'Stalin, a Political Biography,' and a leading authority on Soviet affairs."

This article was published simultaneously in the *Washington Post & Times-Herald*



Burnham

and (in an abridged translation) in the most influential Italian newspaper, *Corriera della Sera* of Milan. A complete French translation was carried in the July 4, 5, 6 issues of *France-Soir*. Headlined news dispatches about the article appeared in most of the leading newspapers of the non-Communist world, including those in the United States. It may be presumed that copyrighter Deutscher raked in a pretty penny for this latest scoop in the most imaginative serial of the decade: *The Myth of the Sino-Soviet Split* (to be continued, and continued, and continued).

Isaac Deutscher, a British citizen, is indeed a well-known writer on Soviet affairs, and undoubtedly is regarded by most persons active in these matters as "a leading authority." He has written a political biography of Trotsky as well as of Stalin, and numerous other books on Soviet and Communist matters. These have been published by the Oxford University Press and other reputable houses, respectfully reviewed in the scholarly as well as commercial media, and assigned as texts to students seeking enlightenment on things Soviet. Deutscher has been a visiting lecturer at Harvard

and other American universities. (A grant from the Rockefeller Foundation enabled him to pursue his researches at Harvard and the Hoover Library for his Trotsky biography.) His articles, which have been printed in many magazines, have lately been appearing in *The Reporter*, the *English New Statesman*, and in *Encounter*, published in London by the American-supported Congress for Cultural Freedom.

It should be added that acceptance of Deutscher's role as a leading authority is not quite universal. The French magazine, *Est & Ouest*, which is as precise in its language as in its scholarship, comments on his achievements as follows: "What above all characterizes the works of this 'Sovietologue' is the distortion of the past by the falsification of facts; and of the present, by fictions. As for his predictions, they are systematically refuted by events." In witness thereof, *Est & Ouest* cites Deutscher's finding, after Stalin's death, that Beria was the leading "liberal reformer," and Khrushchev the die-hard chief of "the Stalinist wing." At the close of the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, Deutscher reported (on the basis of his ever mysterious, secret, and always unnamed sources) that Khrushchev had "fiercely refused" to "repudiate his dead leader." The 20th Congress was the gathering at which Khrushchev was in actuality delivering the historic attack on Stalin and Stalinism that became public a couple of months later.

Eeny, Meeny, Mao

More recently, Deutscher told in *The Reporter* exactly what the Algerian FLN leader, Ferhat Abbas, and Mao Tse-tung had said to each other during Abbas' visit to Peiping. That the Deutscher account differed totally from that which Abbas himself printed somewhat later in the Tunisian magazine *Afrique-Action* is

no doubt to be explained by the superior reliability of Deutscher's sources.

According to Deutscher, his new scoop is a fierce attack on Mao Tse-tung which Khrushchev composed and circulated among the leadership of a number of Communist parties. The *Sunday Times* (et al.) article so characterizes the secret document, and presents, partly in direct quotes, partly in seeming paraphrase, the secret content.

"A new and momentous quarrel," announces Deutscher in his introductory paragraph, "has broken out between Russia and China, and Nikita Khrushchev has been directing a hurricane fire of accusations against Mao Tse-tung. He charges the leader of Chinese Communism with 'disloyalty,' 'subversive agitation,' and 'incitement to world war.' He also threatens Mao that he will at last bring into the open their protracted and hitherto secret or semi-secret dispute."

Curiouser and Curiouser

Within a couple of days after publication—too late to counteract the political effect of this latest chapter of the Sino-Soviet myth, or, presumably, to interfere with Deutscher's fee—several French observers had remarked a curious coincidence. Deutscher's secret Khrushchev document read just like a free English translation of a text printed several weeks earlier in the June-July issue (price, one New Franc) of *Voie communiste*, an obscure organ of opposition (Trotskyite-Titoist) French Communists. This text, in turn, was traced back to a semi-secret pamphlet called "For Ideological Unity in the World Communist Movement," which (with specific references to certain French Communists not found in the subsequent versions) was circulated among oppositionists and French Party members just before the May Congress of the French Communist Party.

In a key passage, for example, the French (VC) text reads:

Lorsque l'intérêt des forces socialistes du monde entier et des peuples exploités des pays capitalistes rendait plus nécessaire que jamais une hardie politique de coexistence pacifique avec des pays hostiles au socialisme, toute initiative soviétique

bribes. They must not use government property for their own benefit.

As far as it goes, the new moral law sounds reasonable, but can it go far enough? The problem of ethical conduct in high places will remain with us as long as humanity remains fallible; and, what is more, the problem is proportional to the power enjoyed by the officials involved. As more and more inside information seeps into Washington; as more and more business is transacted through regulatory agencies; as larger and larger sums of money are dispersed by officials earning Civil Service wages; as more and more commercial decisions rest upon federal approval; so more and more temptations rise up to distract the Washington officialdom. It is the swelling power of the central administration which, like an underground river, feeds the rotting jungle we see above ground. The White House would attack this swamp with pruning shears. This will not serve. The only means of control is to withhold the nutrients of corruption: withhold the power; dry up that Arethusa to the greatest extent possible, and return the control of ordinary affairs to the ordinary citizens.

Buckbeats?

Greenwich Village, long a haven for radicals of the Left, this year found itself inhabited by a new radical breed—an aggressive chapter of Young Americans for Freedom. The question soon arose: Can a conservative, too, be a beat? Queried on this crucial point by the *Village Voice*, both Mrs. Rosemary McGrath, chairman of the YAF chapter, and George Sokolsky, its elder statesman, answered "Yes," and gave their reasons. Came quickly a letter of protest from a reader in Long Island City (square and bourgeois territory), saying the only possible similarity would be physical, since a conservative expresses himself politically, and the true beat retreats to the womb.

Now Mary Nichols, for the *Voice*, has answered the challenge. "There are certain characteristics common to both [conservatives and beats]," she insists; both "are essentially interested primarily in themselves." She quotes Karl E. Meyer, author of *The New America: The Age of the Smooth Deal*, who argues that the cornerstone of both the beat philosophy and William F. Buckley's is the single individual, and that both should be called "Buckbeats." As for the politics *vs.* the womb dispute, Miss Nichols is unimpressed. "Crawling back into the womb," she points out, "has just as much political effect as walking into a voting booth and choosing between Tweedledum and Tweedledee."

For the Record

Senate resolution opposing seating of Red China in UN (vote was 76-0) this year included strong condemnatory clause, inserted by Sen. Dodd, accusing Peiping of playing major part in international narcotics traffic. . . . House of Delegates of American Bar Association, meeting in St. Louis this week, expected to adopt anti-Peiping resolution.

Prospects fair to better-than that conservative Columbia businessman Charles Boineau will be first Republican member elected to South Carolina legislature in August 8 election. . . . Following Tower win, 200 prominent conservative Democrats in Lamb County, Texas, 150 in Harlingen, have publicly announced switch to GOP. . . . Doing effective job in publishing conservative articles in its bulletin, the Foreign Policy Research Institute of South Carolina, headed by Charleston News and Courier associate editor Anthony Harigan. . . . Criticism in Washington growing over number of diplomats, bureaucrats (and relatives) JFK sends around the globe on fact-finding missions.

Mayor Willi Brandt points out that every fifth member country of UN has fewer inhabitants than free Berlin. . . . British Treasury studying advisability of putting British currency on decimal system and of minting plastic, multi-colored coins. . . . Norway's nationalized telephone system admits that more than 800 persons have been waiting for phones for over ten years. . . . Wilson Meat Company, third largest of the U.S. meat packing companies in Argentina, closing down after 48 years because of wildcat strikes. . . . Cuba, which has acute meat shortage, shipped 200 steers, 400 hogs to Soviet Union last month. . . . State Department has refused Lyle Stuart, publisher of many pro-Communist books, permission to visit Cuba. . . . Japan refusing visa to U.S. Communist Herbert Aptheker to take part in Hiroshima commemoration ceremonies later this month. . . . A Japanese film company turning out Nipponese Westerns: every part, from sheriff to outlaw, will be played by Japanese.

Going the rounds in Catholic conservative circles: "Mater sí, Magistra no."

dans le sens de la coopération fut qualifiée par la direction du P. C. chinois comme une trahison, comme un accord avec les occupants de Formose ou comme un sacrifice des intérêts de la Chine populaire à ceux de l'URSS."

And the corresponding *Sunday Times* text: "When our interests . . . , Moscow goes on to say, 'more than ever demanded from us a determined policy of coexistence with the countries hostile to socialism, the leadership of the Chinese Communist parties denounced our every initiative in this direction as treason, as appeasing the invaders of Formosa, or as a sacrifice of the interests of the USSR.'"

By one more coincidence, the same issue of *Voie communiste* printed an article by Deutscher himself.

Deutscher was caught so far out on his limb that on July 23 he had to make public an "explanation." He admitted that VC had printed a document closely similar to "the one he had cited." But he denied that



the VC text was his "principal source." He had got hold of another most secret document from some unnamable spot, and had learned the background from an unnamed "important Communist," etc.

Branko Lazitch, one of the few serious scholars of Communist and Soviet history, has placed a number of paragraphs from the VC and *Sunday Times* texts, comparable to the pair above, in parallel columns. Reading them over makes Deutscher's apologies rather less con-

vincing that they might be, but all things are possible in the fairyland of Sovietology.

Road to Oz

The last big similar sensation in the construction of the Sino-Soviet myth was launched last February over the by-line of another "leading authority on Soviet affairs," Edward Crankshaw, in *The Observer* (London), and escalated by Harry Schwartz in the *New York Times*. The document in that case—wherein Crankshaw and Schwartz quite probably acted in good, if too uncritical, faith—showed on analysis such ignorance of Communist ways that we may infer a non-Communist origin. CIA, an early convert to the Sino-Soviet myth (partly thinking it truth, partly hoping that getting people to believe it will make it truth), has been suggested as a likely source.

M. Lazitch shows by textual analysis that the document which Deutscher borrowed was probably prepared by Titoists. This hypothesis is further indicated by the circumstances of its pre-Deutscher appearances, and has been explicitly affirmed by Auguste Lecoœur, a well-known French oppositionist.

The few emendations that Deutscher has made in the earlier text are not without their political interest. He has shifted the language somewhat, to play up the friendly and politically close relation which the VC text declares to exist between Tito and Moscow as against the provocateurs, wild men, and war-mongers of China and Albania. And he has strengthened the language in which the VC text refers to Mao's bellicosity. The VC text, for example, states that according to Mao "there has been no change whatever in the nature of imperialism since the end of the second World War," so that "the threat of war" (*le danger de guerre*) is still present—orthodox truisms with which no Communist of any tendency would disagree. Deutscher upgrades the formulation to read that "an armed conflict between capitalism and Communism is inevitable in the future." Therefore the USSR should "make use of its present crushing superiority in missiles, bombs and nuclear weapons" in order to bring the United States to



terms, "even if that should lead to war."

But the most significant and imaginative addition updates the text by adding a reference to Berlin—which was not of course in sharp focus when the original texts were prepared. It is "in part because of the Chinese pressure" that Khrushchev has adopted the "hard foreign policy" expressed by the demands on Berlin. "The necessity of competing with Mao Tse-tung for leadership in the Communist camp is an important factor in the decision taken by Khrushchev" to act in relation to Berlin. This "difficult and complicated" Berlin maneuver is "ostensibly directed solely against the West, but in reality is also directed against China."

The underlying political meaning of the whole operation is summarized by M. Lazitch: "Thus, they are trying to shut the West in a false dilemma: choose between Mao, who presses toward the Third World War, and Khrushchev, who, modestly, asks only a change in the status of Berlin."

Two final notes:

1) With only one or two exceptions, the great newspapers of the Western world, which once more allowed themselves to be used as propaganda megaphones for the Communist enterprise (and dupes of unscrupulous journalists), have made no correction or apology, or—we may safely guess—any plans for caution in the future.

2) Some of the most thoroughly informed observers of these matters believe that CIA, learning nothing from its Crankshaw flop, was also a causal link in the chain that this time stretched to Deutscher.

Letter from Austria

CPYRIGHT

The Central Tyrol Powder Keg

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

If it weren't for the serious tension over Berlin and the Algerian imbroglio, the Tyrolean problem would probably dominate the political scene today. This issue affects only a small area, the central part of the Tyrol (misnamed the South Tyrol), but deeply disturbing events often have modest origins. The origins of this quarrel, seemingly affecting only small, happy-go-lucky Austria (pleasantly preoccupied with its sudden prosperity) and Italy, with a population seven times as large, are simple.



Kuehnelt-Leddihn

In 1919 Italy was given the Italian-speaking South Tyrol (Trentino) and the German-speaking Austrian Tyrol very much against the wishes of the latter population. During the thirties, Fascist Italy brutally oppressed the German-speaking people of the Central Tyrol, this time with the connivance of Hitler, who had the renegade's hatred for his native Austria plus expansion toward the East in his mind. He wanted to see the people of the Central Tyrol resettled in the Carpathian regions and in the Crimea.

After World War II, when the high-flown ideals of the Atlantic Charter were so prominently displayed, the Central Tyroleans, with a fine record of resistance against Fascists and Nazis alike, hoped for liberation and reunion with the Austrian Tyrol. But Britain, then under a Labor government, and Moscow, fearing that reintegration of the staunchly conservative and religious Central Tyrol would strengthen the Right in Austria, vetoed this territorial adjustment.

The denial of freedom to the Central Tyroleans was so flagrant that the Allies put pressure on Italy to grant autonomy to the area. A

treaty was signed between defeated Italy and liberated Austria, granting to the German-speaking Central Tyroleans the right to manage their own affairs.

Italy, however, fearful that autonomy might be the first step toward a reunification with Austria, "interpreted" the autonomy status in an exceedingly clever way. It lumped together the Central Tyrol and the Italian-speaking Trentino and gave autonomy to the entire region. This looked magnanimous at first glance, but in practice it made for an Italian majority in the Diet—a splendid example of gerrymandering. The Central Tyroleans, cheated of true autonomy, invoked the aid of the Austrian government as signatory of the original agreement. The Austrian Socialists, partners in the coalition government, belatedly assented to efforts to save the cultural integrity of an area so dear to all patriotic Austrians, and joint conferences were held with the Italians. The United Nations was called in, more joint talks followed, but what the tedious negotiations made clear is that the present Italian government is willing to grant every imaginable minor concession save autonomy and to encourage by any and all means the further immigration of Italians into the artificially industrialized Central Tyrol.

Since we are living in a democratic age, the aim of the Italian Government is to create an Italian majority. Once the valleys of the Central Tyrol will be filled with Italian factory hands, it will be easy enough to stage a plebiscite demonstrating that the people of this area no longer desire local autonomy. The Italian population has risen from three per cent in 1919 to 36 per cent in 1961, and it is against these figures as much as anything that the SVP, the Party of the Autonomists, is waging a desperate battle.

At the present moment this struggle is due to the stubbornness of the

Italian Government as well as to the halfheartedness of Vienna—has taken on most dangerous forms—dangerous to Western unity, dangerous to the whole trend toward European integration. The shrewdness of the Italian tactics (their dilatoriness, since 1946, in implementing the treaty has been a masterpiece of diplomacy and politics in the best Mediterranean tradition) is counterbalanced by an incredible stupidity in strategy. And now the government seems to have lost its head. Thanks to its constant frontal attacks, molestations, and rigidity towards the SVP—which, after all, is led by the moderates—the truly radical elements among the Tyroleans have come to the fore and have resorted to a reprehensible "propaganda of action." It must, however, be said in the latter's defense that world opinion ignored the entire issue until the first dynamite sticks went off, the first high voltage pylons crumbled, and the first hydroelectric plants were damaged.

In countering these terrorist tactics, the Italians, so far, have only killed accidentally a couple of innocents, but it seems now that they are out to make martyrs; every measure they have taken up to now has led to further alienation, further loss of friends or well-wishers. The arrest and keeping in jail for 42 days of an Austrian civil servant on vacation, a woman and a true moderate in Central Tyrolean affairs; the curfew; the reintroduction of visas for Austrians (a measure ruinous to the Italian tourist trade); the refusal to admit an international investigation commission; the proposed law to exile the victims of the Hitler-Mussolini agreement for "anti-national" behavior—all this has weakened their position.

The attitude of the Italian Government not only has forced the rather reluctant hand of the Austrian Socialists; it has invoked the specter of something infinitely worse: German intervention. This does not mean that the Bonn Government will step in because the big parties of Germany (with the exception of the Liberal FDP) are fearful of being accused of Pan-Germanism. But in Europe people of the same (or even of a closely kindred) language have